

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
CASE NO. 3:24-CV-00531-FDW-DCK**

TIMEA CSIKOS BARRACK,

Plaintiff,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendants’ Motion to Remand, (Doc. No. 8), and Magistrate Judge David Keesler’s Memorandum and Recommendation, (Doc. No. 15). For the reasons set forth below, the Court **AFFIRMS** the Memorandum and Recommendation, (Doc. No. 15), and **GRANTS** Defendants’ Motion to Remand, (Doc. No. 8).

The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). “By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Also, absent a specific, proper, and timely filed objection, courts need not give any explanation for adopting a magistrate judge’s recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983) (“Absent objection, we do not believe that any explanation need be given for adopting the report.”).


Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a party fourteen (14) days to file specific written objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations. In his Memorandum and Recommendation, Judge Keesler notified the parties that objections must be filed within the fourteen day timeline. (Doc. No. 15, pp. 8–9.) No objections were filed, and clear error review is appropriate. After a careful review of the record and of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the Court finds no clear error.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Memorandum and Recommendation, (Doc. No. 15), is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Remand, (Doc. No. 8), is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: July 22, 2025


Frank D. Whitney
United States District Judge

